

- 4 -

Remarks

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated October 5, 2005. Amended claims 1-6 and 8 remain for consideration.

The drawings and IDS are noted.

Claims 1, 6, 7 and 8 are rejected as anticipated by Kugler et al (Kugler). Claim 1 has been amended to eliminate reference to "tubes". Claim 1 now refers to "channels formed in a plate", and is not anticipated by Kugler. Claims 6 and 8 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for the same reason. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 6 and 8 over Kugler is hereby requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5-8 are rejected as anticipated by Pinto. Pinto's channels are constructed by walls (Figs. 2B, 2C) and are not "formed in a plate" (claim 1). The rejection alleges that Pinto has "a plurality of conduits of substantially equal length." However, reference to Fig. 2D, or the Abstract figure, shows only conduits (fluid outlets) 218A, 218B, 218C of different lengths. Paragraph 0046 says the distance D of the flows 214A, 214B, 214C may be equal; but these are not conduits. Furthermore, Pinto does not disclose "an inlet fuel distributor" feeding "a fuel inlet manifold". To the extent that there are a plurality of conduits 218A, 218B, 218C in Pinto, those conduits do not comprise the inlet distributor. The inlet distributor in Pinto is the V-shaped portion 206, 208 (p. 0095), which is open. The manifold 200 is unnumbered in the text except in paragraphs 0095 and 0109. However, the manifold 200 is numbered in Fig. 2A and does indeed comprise the plurality of channels. If the channels are the manifold, then what is the fuel distributor? Thus, Pinto does not disclose the apparatus of claim 1 which requires an inlet fuel distributor having a plurality of channels feeding a fuel inlet manifold.

With respect to claim 2, Pinto drives the flow against the surface prior to entering the channels, whereas claim 2 requires that the exits of the channels drive the fuel against the surface. Claims 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8 are patentable as depending from either claim 1 or 2, the patentability of which has been shown hereinbefore.

- 5 -

Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 8 over Pinto is hereby respectfully requested.

Claim 4 is rejected as obvious over Pinto in view of Kugler. Claim 4 is patentable as depending from claim 1, the patentability of which has been described hereinbefore. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of claim 4 over the references is requested.

Should the foregoing not be persuasive, a telephone conference is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



M. P. Williams

Attorney of Record

Voice: 860-649-0305

Fax: 860-649-1385

Email: mw@melpat.com

210 Main Street
Manchester, CT 06042

Date: December 7, 2005